

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 6-9 are currently pending in this case, claims 1, 3, 7 and 9 having been amended and claims 4-5 and 10-11 having been canceled without prejudice by this paper.

The Office Action objects to claims 3-4, 5 and 9-11 because of various informalities. In response thereto, applicant has canceled claims 4-5 and 10-11 without prejudice and has amended claims 3 and 9 to state that the scrubber brush is adapted to contact a substrate along at least a portion of a diameter of the substrate. The Examiner's objections are believed to be addressed by the above claim amendments and/or cancellations. The amendments to claims 3 and 9 are not intended to narrow the scope of either claim.

The rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-11 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. section 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,875,507 (Stephens) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,202,658 (Fishkin), the rejection of claims 1-6 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. section 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,523,553 (Redeker) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,385,805 (Konishi) and the rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-11 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. section 103 as being unpatentable over Stephens in view of Konishi and the Applicant's traversal thereof

---

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-11, applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 7 to both require that the sonic nozzle is angled so as to direct the sonicated fluid spray away from the scrubber brush. Applicant respectfully submits that the Stephens, Fishkin, Redeker and Konishi references, alone or in combination, do not appear to disclose, teach or otherwise suggest so angling a sonic nozzle so as to direct sonicated fluid spray away from a scrubber brush. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 7, and dependent claims 2-3, 6 and 8-9 which depend therefrom, are allowable over these references.